

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. In this amendment, claims 59, 112 and 128 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

### Interview Summary

Applicants thank the Examiner for the telephone interview conducted on June 22, 2005 between the Examiner and the undersigned. During the interview, claim 59 as amended above was discussed as a proposed amendment, and the Examiner agreed that such an amendment would overcome the rejections.

### Discussion of Rejections

Claims 59, 60, 65, 67--70, 75, 76 and 112, 117, 119-121, 126 and 127 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on U.S. Patent no. 5,705,995 of Laflin et al. ("Laflin") in view of U.S. Patent no. 6,351,523 of Detlef ("Detlef"). The remaining claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Laflin and Detlef in view of various other references.

The amendments submitted above are made only to place the claims in what Applicants consider to be better form. The amendments are not made in response to the rejections or to comply with any statutory requirement of patentability, as no such amendments are believed to be necessary.

The rejection of the claims was incorrect for the reasons stated in Applicants' last response (filed on August 30, 2004). Regardless, the rejection is moot in view of the amendments submitted above.

Neither Laflin nor Detlef discloses or suggests (individually or in combination) provisioning a user interface of a wireless communication device, or doing so based on the identified class of contact identifier in a received message, to allow initiation of a task relating to the contact identifier. Further, neither Laflin nor Detlef discloses or suggests (individually or in combination) this, where the provisioning includes determining information to be output by an output component of the wireless communication device. In addition, neither Laflin nor Detlef discloses or suggests (individually or in combination) this, where the user interface is configured in a first configuration if the contact identifier belongs to a first class of contact identifier, and the user interface is configured in a second configuration if the contact identifier belongs to a second class of contact identifier. Therefore, the claimed invention is patentably distinguishable from the cited art for at least these reasons.

#### Dependent Claims

In view of the above remarks, a specific discussion of the dependent claims is considered to be unnecessary. Therefore, Applicants' silence regarding any dependent claim is not to be interpreted as agreement with, or acquiescence to, the rejection of such claim or as waiving any argument regarding that claim.


Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly requested.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,  
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: June 23, 2005

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jordan M. Becker  
Reg. No. 39,602

12400 Wilshire Blvd.  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(408) 720-8300